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Researchers investigating the effects of performance appraisals and goal setting techniques have focused on laboratory (rather than field) settings and/or have relied on self-report or anecdotal data to draw their conclusions. The major objectives of the present study were to examine the effects of 1) goal setting on actual job performance in a community organizational setting and 2) performance appraisals on both subsequent job performance and goals set. Two male and two female counselors in a residential treatment center served as subjects in the study which utilized a multiple baseline design. The performance of 18 repetitive administrative/custodial tasks were measured as a function of goal setting and performance appraisals. The goal setting procedure alone had no consistent effect on subsequent behavior rates; however, under conditions of post-appraisal goal setting, task completion percentages for specific behaviors temporarily increased for three out of four subjects. Suggestions for future research are given.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The issue of maximizing productivity while minimizing the expenditure of human resources stands as possibly the single most enduring concern in the field of organizational behavioral management. A common economic procedure is the performance appraisal that a supervisor delivers to an employee. Its potential as a motivating operation, however, must be empirically substantiated. Despite the volume and range of investigation devoted to the economy of motivation, a review of the literature reveals two relatively neglected aspects of research on appraisals. First, the majority of studies on human performance to date have been conducted in laboratory rather than field settings. This proliferation of laboratory investigations has proven valuable by allowing for the demonstration of experimental control over work-related behaviors; however, tests for generality in field settings have been few and contradictory. Secondly, of the investigators who have conducted their studies in field settings, most based their conclusions on self report or anecdotal data instead of actual performance data. The parameters of investigation have differed across previous studies, as have the mixture of independent variables examined.

Various investigators have endeavored to account for the effect(s) of factors such as specific reinforcement conditions, varying forms of feedback, and appraisal style, but in the course of their analyses, have relied on hypotheses and/or measurement instruments that seem to

If an appraisal has an effect on worker productivity, it remains to be explained how this occurs. An appraisal is given at one point in time and the work is completed at another point in time. One possibility is that the appraisal changes what workers say about their work and then work differently. As noted, many researchers have measured only the former. In light of this, two major areas of study are worthy of consideration: (a) the use and effects of job performance appraisals and (b) the use and effects of goal setting procedures. Historically, performance appraisals have been assumed to have positive effects on the subsequent job performance of the reviewee (Kearney, 1978; Fletcher, 1973). The use of appraisals gained rapid acceptance and popularity, leading to the scientific community's interest in validating the long held assumption of their effectiveness (Stewart, 1965). This ensuing interest, however, often took the form of translating performance into "satisfaction" (with the interviewer, the interview itself, the review system, etc.) and the implication that improved performance would result from a satisfied reviewee (Fletcher, 1973; Fletcher & Wilcox, 1969). The remaining minority of researchers who did, in fact, attempt to analyze changes in performance following job reviews relied heavily on self-reported or self-estimated changes in job performance (Bassett & Meyer, 1968; Fletcher, 1973; Fletcher & Williams, 1976; Meyer & Walker, 1961).
Such self-report or anecdotal data are dangerous in that they seem to equate verbal behavior about performance (saying) with actual performance behavior (doing). Although both verbal and nonverbal behaviors are elements in the appraisal-performance relationship, this relationship must not be oversimplified, as the controlling variables for each are likely to differ. It is notable that the performance reviews themselves are comprised almost exclusively of verbal behavior and yet are designed to exert control over the future occurrence of almost exclusively nonverbal behavior (job performance). In most cases, the appraisal is conducted in a setting other than that in which job tasks are performed and with different persons present. Furthermore their occurrence is temporally removed from the occasions for actually performing the work described. Considering the diverse stimulus conditions which may exist, it is essential that both verbal and nonverbal aspects be empirically examined; hence the need for utilizing actual performance data as opposed to relying exclusively on self-reports. Armstrong (1981) examined the relationship between appraisals and actual performance in an academic setting, however the author's search of published studies of job performance appraisals revealed no systematic analysis that was both based on actual performance data and conducted in a field setting.

The second area of investigation, that concerning the effects of goal setting procedures, has also emphasized laboratory experiments and dealt with tasks involving arithmetic, perceptual, and psychomotor skills (Erez, 1976; Locke, 1967; Locke & Bryan, 1969; Motowidlo, Loehr & Dunnett, 1978; Terborg, 1975). The few researchers operating in
field settings have examined the effects of goal setting on performance but without always accounting for possibly relevant variables such as "knowledge of results" (Locke, 1967), differences in training (Ivancevich, 1975), various forms of feedback (Latham & Locke, 1979), and conditions of reinforcement (Latham, Mitchell & Dossett, 1978). Studies performed with subjects in natural (or non-laboratory) settings have also tended to ignore possible changes in the quality of work done concomitant with changes in the amount of work done (Latham & Yukl, 1975). As an illustration, in the classic series of field experiments conducted by Latham & Locke (1979), independent logging crews were compared for productivity and attendance levels under conditions of goal setting and no goal setting. Crews were matched on the basis of size, mechanization level, terrain worked, productivity, attendance, and supervisory style; half were given production goals. The researchers noted that loggers operating under goal setting conditions were also given individual tallymeters (to record every time a tree was felled) and weekly records of performance; however, the resultant changes in performance and attendance levels were attributed solely to goal setting. Latham & Locke summarize their findings by stating:

In a 14 year program of research, we have found that goal setting does not necessarily have to be part of a wider management system to motivate performance effectively. It can be used as a technique in its own right. (p. 69)

It appears that goal setting has been given credit where, in fact, other concurrent independent variables may be at least partially responsible for the results obtained.

Researchers acknowledge that some goal setting procedures work
better than others due to goal variants such as specificity, difficulty, acceptance, direction, commitment, etc. (Locke, E. A., Saari, L. M., Shaw, K. N., & Latham, G. P., 1981). Goal setting, however, is important not only as a means of influencing behavior, but also as a measure of verbal behavior. Verbal behavior itself may change via the intervention of a procedure such as (in this case) performance appraisal; any such changes in verbal behavior would then be reflected by changes in the self-set goals of employees.

Thus the current study measured employee self-selected goals, focused on what effects the goal selection might have on actual performance, and examined the effect(s) of performance appraisal on both goal selection and actual performance rates.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Four child-care counselors served as subjects, comprising the entire morning staff of one unit in a residential treatment setting (for delinquent youth). The two male and two female staff members ranged in age from 26 to 30 years old, and were selected by the experimenter to serve as subjects based on their stability in attendance and because they could be observed with minimal disruption to the daily routines of the setting's residents. Each of the staff members had been employed full time by the agency for between two and six years (average four years) and had worked their current shift (6:00 AM to 2:00 PM Monday through Friday) for between one and three years (average two). Prior to participating in the study, each subject signed an "Informed Consent" form (Appendix A), which briefly outlined the intervention procedure and guaranteed confidentiality of all individual data taken on their performance.

Procedure

Prior to the initiation of this study, each of the setting's employees received a performance appraisal once a year. To prepare for the annual appraisal, the supervisor utilized a copy of the agency's performance review form (see Figure 1) to score the employee's job
Figure 1. Performance Review Form
# LAKESIDE - PERFORMANCE REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>Classification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## JOB KNOWLEDGE

- How well does this employee understand the requirements of the job and meet expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee understand all aspects of the job?</td>
<td>How well does this employee exceed all aspects of the job?</td>
<td>How well does this employee meet the knowledge to do the job?</td>
<td>How well does this employee have sufficient knowledge of some aspects?</td>
<td>How well does this employee have limited knowledge?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COOPERATION

- How well does this employee work harmoniously and effectively with others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee work and succeed at the same time?</td>
<td>How well does this employee work and overcome difficulties?</td>
<td>How well does this employee work and promote harmony?</td>
<td>How well does this employee work and show enthusiasm?</td>
<td>How well does this employee work and show leadership?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ACCEPTANCE OF SUPERVISION

- How well does this employee respond to and utilize supervision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee respond to and utilize supervision?</td>
<td>How well does this employee respond to and utilize supervision?</td>
<td>How well does this employee respond to and utilize supervision?</td>
<td>How well does this employee respond to and utilize supervision?</td>
<td>How well does this employee respond to and utilize supervision?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RESPONSIBILITY

- How well does this employee accept the responsibilities of the job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee accept responsibility?</td>
<td>How well does this employee accept responsibility?</td>
<td>How well does this employee accept responsibility?</td>
<td>How well does this employee accept responsibility?</td>
<td>How well does this employee accept responsibility?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INITIATIVE

- How well does this employee carry out tasks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## QUALITY OF WORK

- How well does this employee carry out tasks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PUNCTUALITY

- How well does this employee carry out tasks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DEPENDABILITY

- How well does this employee carry out tasks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
<td>How well does this employee carry out tasks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMMUNICATION

- How effectively does this employee communicate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee communicate?</td>
<td>How well does this employee communicate?</td>
<td>How well does this employee communicate?</td>
<td>How well does this employee communicate?</td>
<td>How well does this employee communicate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TREATMENT

- How well does this employee treat others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this employee treat others?</td>
<td>How well does this employee treat others?</td>
<td>How well does this employee treat others?</td>
<td>How well does this employee treat others?</td>
<td>How well does this employee treat others?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMMENTS (including action, if any, to help employee improve performance):

Supervisor's Signature

The employee hereby acknowledges receipt of a completed copy of this review.
performance from one to five on each of the eleven general behavioral categories listed. The employees then met individually with their immediate supervisor for an hour to discuss performance ratings and any areas requiring improvement. The eleven general behavior categories listed on the performance review form functioned as the only guidelines given the supervisor for evaluating employee performance.

The current study measured the daily performance of 18 required custodial and administrative tasks (see Figure 2) as the dependent variable. These tasks were specified to the setting's employees upon being hired via a "Job Shift Task List" compiled by the agency (Appendix B). The 18 were selected for observation from the original list of 43 tasks on the basis of:

1) Frequent comments from the supervisory staff to the effect that certain repetitive tasks seemed to constitute consistent performance problems and yet were important to the functioning of the agency. (Data were not systematically collected for these tasks outside of the present study, however).

2) The fact that such tasks were not related to direct client service (i.e., were administrative rather than therapeutic), thus were not subject to regulation and had fewer "built-in consequences". For example, failure to fill out a form was less likely to be noted immediately than failure to prepare the residents' meals.

The experimenter coded each of the 18 observed tasks according to which of the behavioral categories on the agency's job performance review form it best exemplified. For example, the task "Fill out Repair Request forms for needed work by maintenance staff" was coded as constituting both "Initiative (or how well does employee confront task?)" and "Communication (or how well does employee communicate—both verbally and in writing?)" from the review form in Figure 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Figure 2. List of Observed Tasks
LIST OF OBSERVED TASKS

1. Sign in on time sheet.
2. Fill out any necessary illness or injury reports.
3. Post illness/injury reports or a note specifying that none are needed.
4. Dispense medication.
5. Record Medication.
6. Fill out school sheets.
7. Fill out any necessary repair requests.
8. Post repair requests or a note specifying that none are needed.
10. Laundry: Wash.
11. Laundry: Dry.
12. Laundry: Return.
18. Sign out on time sheet.
Such coding, it was theorized, would allow the experimenter to more accurately observe any effects of periodic performance appraisals (covering general competencies) on the actual rate of performing specific, repetitive job activities. The codings were not known by the subjects or their supervisor.

A multiple baseline design across subjects was utilized incorporating the phases of baseline, goal-setting, and post-performance appraisal goal-setting.

**Baseline**

During baseline conditions, all four subjects were observed each work day for a one hour period at the beginning of their shift. During this period subjects were checked for completion of scheduled tasks, while the observer also checked the previous day's timesheets, logs, etc., for permanent products recording. Certain complex tasks were recorded by indicating completion of each of their constituent behaviors. For example the "Laundry" task was broken down into the four components of gathering soiled clothing, washing, drying, and returning clean laundry. Thus, some tasks originally specified as one area on the task list were actually recorded as several behaviors.

The criterion for advancing to the goal-setting phase with each subject was a stable rate of responding during baseline conditions. Weekly percentages of completion of the 18 individual tasks were graphed, as was the daily average completion of the total 18 tasks.

**Goal Setting**

Under conditions of goal-setting, the subjects took a few minutes at the beginning of their shift every Monday to specify at least two
job performance improvements they would endeavor to make during the coming week. The brief form (see Figure 3) given the subjects for goal-setting listed six of the general behavior categories utilized on the agency's performance review form and instructed the subject to select two or three of the categories to guide them in describing one-sentence goals for the week. The instructions given on this goal-setting form were revised twice (on successive weeks of intervention with the second subject) in an attempt to shape more specific goal responses from the subjects.

**Post-Performance Appraisal**

The supervisor conducted the first and second performance appraisals (with subjects A and B) exactly as he always had in pre-baseline conditions. The experimenter did not provide the supervisor with any data on performance to guide his review. With the third and fourth performance reviews (subjects C and D), the staff supervisor agreed to incorporate the shift task list to illustrate specific tasks for each general competency rated on the performance review form. The experimenter then provided the supervisor with averaged performance data for several of the reviewee's highest and lowest rate behaviors so that accurate and specific directional feedback could be given during the third and fourth appraisals. All performance appraisals were tape-recorded.

The experimenter and a staff member from the afternoon shift served as primary observers; another PM shift member performed reliability checks on the average of once every six work days. The observers scored each of the 18 behaviors as completed or not completed to
Figure 3. Goal Setting Form
Please select two or three performance categories which you plan to work on (in terms of your personal on-the-job performance) for the coming week. Specify your goals for your actions in the space provided for each of the categories you select (one or two sentences for each will be fine — I just need some idea of what you want to improve on and how). Thank you for your time!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>√ 2 or 3</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR CATEGORY</th>
<th>GOALS FOR THIS WEEK:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting and responding to supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting the daily responsibilities of the job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative (confronting tasks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of work (accomplishing objectives of the job)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Productivity (the amount of work you turn out)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication skills (communicating both verbally and in writing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
criterion and calculated standard reliability

\[
\left( \frac{\# \text{ of agreements}}{\# \text{ of agreements and disagreements}} \times 100 \right)
\]

for both direct observation

and permanent products measures. Reliability ranged from 58% to 100%,

averaging 89%.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The goal setting procedure alone had no consistent effect on subsequent behavior rates; however, under conditions of post-appraisal goal setting, task completion percentages for specific behaviors temporarily increased for three out of four subjects.

Table 1 shows individual subjects' percent of task completion for each of the 18 daily administrative/custodial tasks selected for observation during baseline, goal setting, and post-performance appraisal goal setting. Subjects A, C, and D demonstrated some decrease in overall percent task completion from baseline to goal setting followed by no change or a slight increase in the overall response rate during post-appraisal goal setting. Subject B demonstrated a decrease in overall percent task completion (across the 18 observed behaviors) from baseline to goal setting and again during post-appraisal goal setting. Considerable variability appeared both within and across subjects, with frequent within-week fluctuations.

Of the 18 administrative/custodial tasks selected for experimental observation, only eight were ever specified as goals by any of the subjects; an additional five of the observed behaviors were also targeted as goals although in less specific terms. Table 1 indicates that there was some repetition of goals across both subjects and phases. Thus, 13 of the 18 observed behaviors were selected as goals at some time; including repetitions, there were 33 separate instances of
Table 1. Average Weekly Performance Rates of 18 Administrative/Custodial Tasks per Subject per Phase.

Heavily outlined boxes indicate goal selection by the subjects

Dotted lines indicate a task that were stated as a general goal by the subjects

Asterisks indicate tasks specified during the appraisal as being performed at an acceptable rate

Plus signs indicate tasks specified during the appraisal as "needing improvement"
|       | S       | T   | IN | OUT | HOSP/HOME | PULL | PULL | PAYMENT | PRESCRIPTIONS | MARKET | REPAIR | REQUEST | LIVING | LAUNDRY | POT | DINER | POT | COOKER | POT | ETCHER | POT | STORE | POT | BATH | POT | FLOOR | POT | OVERALL |
|-------|---------|-----|----|-----|-----------|------|------|----------|---------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
| A     |         |     | 2  | 2   | 67.6      | 15.6 | 32.6 | 6        | 100            | 100    | 100    | 100     | 100    | 100     | 75  | 25     | 100 | 100    | 70  | 63.5   | 62  | 57.0   |
|      | Baseline|     |    |     |           |      |      |          |                |        |        |         |        |         |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 2.5| 2.5 | 19.3     | 19.3 | 11   | 3.6     | 8.3            | 4      | 4      | 100     | 100    | 100     | 83  | 50     | 21.5| 71.5   | 71  | 63.5   | 62  | 57.0   |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 1.5| 1.5 | 22      | 22   | 92   | 51.3    | 40.6           | 4.6    | 4.6    | 100     | 100    | 100     | 87  | 50     | 87  | 90.2   | 79  | 27.9   | 9   | 49.0   |
| B     |         |     | 17 | 17  | 2       | 2    | 26.6 | 16     | 52.6           | 4      | 4      | 100     | 100    | 100     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 64.4   |
|      | Baseline |     |    |     |           |      |      |          |                |        |        |         |        |         |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 3.5| 3.5 | 12.2     | 12.2 | 94   | 66.5    | 77.5           | 12     | 12     | 100     | 100    | 100     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 55.5   |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 3.5| 3.5 | 11.3     | 11.3 | 87   | 51.3    | 40.6           | 4.6    | 4.6    | 100     | 100    | 100     | 71  | 57     | 71  | 79     | 79  | 79     | 79  | 45.5   |
| C     |         |     | 17 | 17  | 2       | 2    | 26.6 | 16     | 52.6           | 4      | 4      | 100     | 100    | 100     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 55.5   |
|      | Baseline |     |    |     |           |      |      |          |                |        |        |         |        |         |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 3.5| 3.5 | 19.3     | 19.3 | 33   | 3.6     | 83             | 3.6    | 3.6    | 100     | 100    | 100     | 85  | 61     | 83  | 83     | 83  | 83     | 83  | 41.3   |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 2.5| 2.5 | 22      | 22   | 92   | 51.3    | 40.6           | 4.6    | 4.6    | 100     | 100    | 100     | 71  | 57     | 71  | 88.6   | 98  | 21.6   | 6.6 | 51.5   |
| D     |         |     | 10 | 10  | 2       | 2    | 26.6 | 16     | 52.6           | 4      | 4      | 100     | 100    | 100     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 20.0   |
|      | Baseline |     |    |     |           |      |      |          |                |        |        |         |        |         |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |     |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 3.5| 3.5 | 12.2     | 12.2 | 94   | 66.5    | 77.5           | 12     | 12     | 100     | 100    | 100     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 75     | 75  | 55.5   |
|      | Goal Setting |   | 2.5| 2.5 | 22      | 22   | 92   | 51.3    | 40.6           | 4.6    | 4.6    | 100     | 100    | 100     | 83  | 83     | 83  | 83     | 83  | 83     | 83  | 70.3   |
an observed task being selected as a goal. Table 2 shows that when a task was selected as a goal it usually remained at (the already) high level or improved by at least 10% (if below 90%). Tasks that were self-selected for improvement increased or maintained more often than those not selected. However, in 24 of these 33 instances of goal selection, the behavior selected by a subject for improvement was already being performed at a rate at or above 75% of the time.

During job performance appraisals, eight instances of the observed tasks were singled out by the subjects' supervisor as "needing improvement" by one or another of the subjects. Subsequently, five instances of those tasks were selected as goals by one or another of the subjects during the post-appraisal goal setting phase. Prior to the performance appraisals, none of those tasks specified by the supervisor as requiring improvement had been selected as goals by any of the subjects. Table 3 shows a comparison of those tasks specified by the supervisor as "needing improvement" and those that were never mentioned during the performance appraisal. Performance of tasks mentioned by the supervisor improved more often than did performance of those not mentioned.

Following the performance appraisals, the only job tasks showing pronounced improvement were those specified by the supervisor during the appraisal as needing improvement. The improvement varied across subjects and ranged from 5% to 35% over baseline rates. This increased rate of responding on specified tasks attenuated after two to three weeks in all cases, regardless of whether or not the subject had selected that task as a goal following their performance review.
Table 2. Changes in Tasks Self-Selected as Goals and those Not Selected as Goals.
Table 2
Changes in Tasks Self-Selected as Goals and Tasks Not Selected as Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Type</th>
<th>Goal Type</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-selected as Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Which Increased</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 10% or Maintained</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Selected as Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Which Increased</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 10% or Maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3. Post-Appraisal Improvements in Task Performance
Table 3
Post-Appraisal Improvements in Task Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Action</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of tasks specified as needing improvement.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number which increased by 10% or more.</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of tasks never mentioned during appraisal.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number which increased by 10% or more.</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The most salient conclusion to be drawn from the above data is the fact that, in a natural organizational setting, standard performance appraisals in tandem with this type of goal setting program do not have the general and prolonged positive effects on subsequent task performance with which they have traditionally been credited. Indeed, improvements in the performance of specific tasks were recorded during conditions of post-appraisal goal setting, however those increases attenuated within the four weeks following the appraisal. During post-appraisal goal setting the overall performance of subjects did not demonstrate a marked increase, although those tasks specifically mentioned by the supervisor as requiring improvement did temporarily increase in completion rate and then drop to pre-appraisal levels of performance regardless of whether or not they were targeted as post-appraisal goals by the subjects themselves.

The supervisor had incorporated task-specific corrective feedback during subjects C and D's appraisals, and only general corrective feedback when appraising subjects A and B. This may more effectively have served to direct the subsequent setting of goals by subjects C and D (subject A demonstrated this effect to a very limited extent, whereas subject B failed to demonstrate such goal direction at all). This raises an important point about the relationship between "saying" and "doing" when setting one's own performance goals: a fairly weak
positive correlation was demonstrated between those tasks most in need of improvement (i.e., those of persistently low performance rates) and those selected as goals by the subjects. All subjects tended to choose as goals the very tasks which they performed most readily (i.e., with relatively high rates) and therefore required the least amount of change in actual performance to demonstrate positive results of goal setting. This is congruent with Skinner's (1953) contention that:

> We prepare aversive stimuli which will control our own future behavior when we make a resolution. This is essentially a prediction concerning our own behavior. By making it in the presence of people who supply aversive stimulations when a prediction is not fulfilled, we arrange consequences which are likely to strengthen the behavior resolved upon. (p. 273)

Subjects could minimize the likelihood of such aversiveness by selecting tasks already being performed well. Skinner's statement also points out the importance of social variables in maintaining the correspondence between saying and doing. The two were separated in this study by having employees report their goals to the experimenter who did not control the consequences for actual completion of tasks. The results showed that changes in statements about tasks were independent of changes in actual task completion. This is an important demonstration which bears on studies which measure only verbal report data. Greater correspondence between saying and doing should result when the same person hears the goal statement and also delivers the consequences for its completion. Further research could assess this question.

Areas of possible future research are also suggested by the inter-
play of results from previous studies in the area of organizational performance enhancement and certain problems that arose during the course of the present study. First, despite goal setting revisions and scripted instructions to subjects, the experimenter encountered considerable difficulty in evoking specific action goals from the subjects. Subject responses on the weekly goal setting forms tended to be in terms of attitudes toward tasks or general job responsibilities ("During this coming week I would like to work at being more positive about keeping up with the duties of our shift") rather than descriptive of specific tasks ("This week I'm going to try to remember to sign John's, Billy's, and Frank's medication logs within 15 minutes of having given them their medication at 8:00 a.m."). This problem was due, at least in part, to the fact that goal setting in the present study was done entirely by the subjects themselves rather than in participation with their supervisor or the supervisor alone (Latham and Yukl, 1975; Steers and Porter, 1974). If future studies were to grant the supervisor more active participation in setting goals with individual subjects, one function of this participation would be to establish guidelines and/or criteria for the necessary degree of goal specificity. The setting of clear and specific goals would serve a dual purpose in that to do so could also aid in establishing a more objective and performance-oriented format (McGregor, 1957; Steers and Porter, 1974) for the performance appraisals. Another essential function (Erez, 1976) of subject/supervisor cooperation would be directing goals appropriately (that is, focusing on low rate behaviors); this necessitates the use of current and accurate actual
performance data rather than subjective performance estimates (Bassett and Meyer, 1968) or self reports (Kay and Meyer, 1965). The need exists for future researchers to conduct actual data-based analyses of these and multitudes of other possibly relevant variables of human performance in community organizational settings.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

Lakeside's administration has approved the initiation of a study in the A-unit, which will examine some new procedures intended to help you carry out your daily and weekly tasks. These new procedures will begin during the early part of 1982 and will not in any way change your job description, status, or routine tasks although you will periodically be requested to fill out brief forms or questionnaires. If you agree to participate, the information gathered from such questionnaires will remain completely anonymous and confidential (that is, your assistant unit supervisor, unit supervisor, and Lakeside administrative staff will not have access to it at any time unless you first approve it in writing). Furthermore, you have the right to withdraw your consent at any time during the study; however I would request that you would submit your reasons in writing if you do so although this is in no way required. You will suffer no adverse consequences if you do not agree to participate.

I greatly appreciate your support and will be happy to give you complete details of the rationale and results at the end of the study.

I have read the above, understand it, and agree to participate.

____________________  ____________________
SIGNATURE           WITNESS

____________________
DATE
APPENDIX B

TASK LIST - A.M. SHIFT

Sign in to work on time sheet.

Check bulletin board in kitchen for messages, medical appointments, Illness and Injury instructions.

Check bulletin board in center hallway for schedules, memos, announcements.

Check your mailbox in Program Office.

Read daily logs.

Check routine cards and routine sheets for accuracy and completion by overnight staff.

Check point restriction cards and charts for accuracy and completion by overnight staff.

Monitor and supervise wake-up, and assign routine points. (Each kid exchanges dirty socks for clean ones during wake-up routine.)

Report all non-emergency medical concerns to Nurse using Illness and Injury form. Post on kitchen board.

Prepare breakfast.

Monitor and supervise breakfast behavior (sit at table with kids, go back with group for hand washing and teeth brushing), and assign routine points.

Dispense prescribed medication at appropriate times and record it in medication logs (generally wake-up and 8 a.m.).

Monitor and supervise after-breakfast jobs, and assign routine points. (Start dishwasher).

Monitor and supervise quiet activity before school.

Make out school sheets for each child. Elementary kids have a weekly sheet. Jr. High kids have a daily sheet. Make comments to teachers daily.

Monitor and supervise children going to school or bus.
Do morning room checks and assign routine points.

Fill out Repair Requests for needed work by maintenance staff and post on center hallway closet door.

Obtain daily food supplies from the Main kitchen. Use order book.

Mondays and Fridays - Obtain canned goods, meats, condiments, etc., as well.

Mondays - order needed cleaning and paper supplies from maintenance.

Mondays - order needed hygiene supplies from unit buyer.

Mondays - make out new weekly routine data sheets for each of the 11 kids in cottage.

1st of month - make out new monthly med log sheets for each child receiving prescribed medication.

Do laundry according to posted schedule.

Check cottage mailboxes in receptionist's office.

Prepare lunch.

Monitor and supervise children's return from on-grounds school.

Monitor and supervise lunch behavior (sit at table with kids, go back with group for hand washing and teeth brushing), and assign routine points.

Dispense prescribed medication at appropriate time and record in med log (generally 12 noon).

Monitor and supervise after lunch jobs, and assign routine points (start dishwasher).

Monitor and supervise children's orderly return to school.

Make afternoon room checks and assign routine points.

Throughout the day, utilize verbal praise and bonus points in reinforcing appropriate behavior.

Throughout the day, use verbal and established cues, then graduated time-out procedure in dealing with inappropriate behavior. Record all time-outs on time out data sheet. Record all Q.R. incidents in Q.R. logs.

Make entry in daily logs for each of the 11 children in cottage.
Post any message to other staff or shifts on kitchen bulletin board.

Drop all completed Q.R. logs and Unusual Incident reports in overnight box in center hallway closet.

Be sure all available routine points are recorded on daily routine cards and weekly routine data sheets before leaving shift.

Be sure all point restriction totals are recorded up to your departure time. Drop completed P.R. charts in A.U.S. mailbox.

Assure that kitchen is clean and orderly. Unload dishwasher.

Assure that laundry room is clean and in order.

Assure that dining room and common living areas are clean and in order.

Sign out on time sheet and total your hours for that day. On Friday total your hours for that week.
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